UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,583	03/25/2004	Jason M. Bell	AUS920040052US1	7109

45993 7590 10/17/2007

IBM CORPORATION (RHF)
C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ
P. O. BOX 23324
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123

EXAMINER	
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,583	BELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly Lovel	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 July 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 30 July 2007.

2. Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 14 are independent. In the Amendment filed 30 July 2007, claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 13-19 were amended. This Action is made Final.

3. The rejections of Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0147857 to Sanchez, II et al in view of US PGPub 20050021498 to Boreham et al have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2002/0147857 to Sanchez, II et al (hereafter Sanchez) in view of US PGPub 2004/0031058 to Reisman (hereafter Reisman).

Referring to claim 1, Sanchez discloses a logical device for handling dynamic attributes in a static directory comprising:

a set of attribute declarations [list of attributes] containing at least one declaration for a directory attribute (see [0050]);

at least one Real-time Attribute Processor (RTAP) [persistent data manager 81] configured to determine a value for an attribute (see [0044] and [0048]);

an RTAP selector configured to select and invoke an RTAP according to a predetermined selection schema (see [0030], lines 7-15); and

a directory attribute processor configured to parse requests for access to directory attribute values, to detect requests for attributes declared in said attribute declarations, to operate said RTAP selector to invoke a corresponding RTAP (see [0056]), to receive an attribute value determined by said invoked RTAP, and to return said attribute value to a requester [populating the object] (see [0062]).

However, Sanchez fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the attributes are to be handled dynamically as a real-time attribute whose value is retrievable outside of static memory of a directory structure and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure, and by converting said obtained value to conform to a directory request return format. Boreham discloses the wherein the attributes are to be handled dynamically as a real-time attribute whose

value is retrievable outside of static memory of a directory structure and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure (see [0189] and [0754]), and by converting said obtained value to conform to a directory request return format (se [0106]) in order to process real-time data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize dynamic attributes as disclosed by Reisman with the logical device of Sanchez. One would have been motivated to so in order to improve the efficiency when processing real-time data.

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Sanchez and Reisman (hereafter Sanchez/Reisman) discloses the logical device as set forth in claim 1 wherein said directory attribute processor is further adapted to suppress storage of said attribute value in a directory [use standard attributes] (Sanchez: see [0029]-[0031]).

Referring to claim 3, Sanchez/Boreham discloses the logical device as set forth in claim 1 wherein said RTAP selector is configured to select an RTAP based upon a variation of a name of said resolved directory attribute (Sanchez: see [0019] and [0031]).

Referring to claim 4, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the logical device as set forth in claim 3 wherein said name variation comprises a name identifying a function selected from the group of a logical device, a device address, a name of a JAVA class [Java objects], a name of a UNIX shared object, and a name of a dynamically linked library module (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 5, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the logical device as set forth in claim 1 wherein said RTAP comprises a function selected from the group of a logical device, a device address, a name of a JAVA class [Java objects], a name of a UNIX shared object, and a name of a dynamically linked library module (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 6, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the logical device as set forth in claim 1 wherein said RTAP and said directory attribute processor are configured to handle Lightweight Directory Access Protocol [LDAP] requests for attribute values (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 7, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the logical device as set forth in claim 1 wherein said directory attribute processor is configured to disallow attribute modify requests for attributes declared as real-time (Sanchez: see [0038]).

Referring to claim 8, Sanchez discloses a method for dynamically handling attributes in a static directory server comprising:

providing at least one declaration for an attribute in association with a set of directory attribute declarations [list of attributes] (see [0050]);

parsing requests for access to directory attribute values to detect requests for attributes declared in said attribute declarations (see [0056]);

invoking at least one Real-time Attribute Processor (RTAP) selected according to a predetermined selection schema, said RTAP being configured to determine a value for an attribute declared as said set of attribute declarations, said dynamic value being unavailable from said static directory (see [0056]); and

returning to a requester an attribute value determined by said invoked RTAP [populating the object] (see [0062]).

However, Sanchez fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the attributes are to be handled dynamically as a real-time attribute whose value is retrievable outside of static memory of a directory structure and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure, and by converting said obtained value to conform to a directory request return format. Boreham discloses the wherein the attributes are to be handled dynamically as a real-time attribute whose value is retrievable outside of static memory of a directory structure and obtaining an attribute value from a real-time source external to said directory structure (see [0189] and [0754]), and by converting said obtained value to conform to a directory request return format (se [0106]) in order to process real-time data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize dynamic attributes as disclosed by Reisman with the logical device of Sanchez. One would have been motivated to so in order to improve the efficiency when processing real-time data.

Referring to claim 9, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of selecting and invoking a RTAP selector comprises selecting an RTAP based upon a variation of a name of said requested directory attribute [use standard attributes] (Sanchez: see [0029]-[0031]).

Referring to claim 10, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the method as set forth in claim 9 wherein said step of selecting an RTAP based upon an attribute name variation

comprises selecting an RTAP from the group of a logical device, a device address, a name of a JAVA class [Java objects], a name of a UNIX shared object, and a name of a dynamically linked library module (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 11, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of invoking an RTAP comprises invoking an RTAP from the group of a logical device, a device address, a name of a JAVA class [Java objects], a name of a UNIX shared object, and a name of a dynamically linked library module (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 12, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of parsing a request comprises parsing a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol [LDAP] requests for attribute values (Sanchez: see [0008]).

Referring to claim 13, Sanchez/Reisman discloses the method as set forth in claim 8 wherein said step of returning to-a requester an attribute value comprises returning said value [populating the object] according to a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (Sanchez: see [0062]).

Referring to claims 14-19, the claims are directed towards a computer-readable medium and are therefore rejected on the same grounds as the method.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

14 October 2007
kml

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100